1893

# THE REMONSTRANCE.

## BOSTON.

**The Remonstrance is addressed to the Legislatures of the several States by Women Remonstrants against the extension of the suffrage to women. It expresses the views of such Remonstrants in Massachusetts, Maine, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.**

### MUNICIPAL SUFFRAGE.

THE suffrage agitation this year is concentrated on the effort to secure to women the right to vote at municipal elections. If the votes of recent Massachusetts Legislatures are evidence, this particular form of the suffrage propaganda does not appear to be making headway. In 1889 the vote of the Massachusetts House upon a municipal suffrage bill, including pairs, was 90 yeas and 139 nays. In 1890 the vote in the House upon a similar bill, including pairs, was 73 yeas and 141 nays, a loss of 17 to the affirmative and a gain of 2 to the negative column, or a net loss of 19 for the bill. Apparently discouraged with this action of the House, the suffragists introduced their bill into the Senate in 1891, and the vote there, including pairs, was yeas, 12, nays, 25. In 1892 the vote in the Senate on a similar bill was yeas, 10, nays, 22.

### SUFFRAGE DEFEATS IN CANADA.

LAST year was an unfavorable year for woman suffrage in Canada as well as in the United States and Great Britain. In Manitoba, in April, a proposition to give women the right to parliamentary suffrage on the same terms as men was defeated in the provincial parliament. In the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island in the same month, a like proposition met a like fate. The Legislature of Nova Scotia defeated a similar measure in 1891.

## RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

### RESULTS IN 1890.

Bills to confer municipal suffrage upon women were defeated in New York, Massachusetts, and Vermont. Constitutional conventions in Mississippi and Kentucky rejected propositions to give women the ballot. The North Dakota House voted down a proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution. In South Dakota, after a vigorous campaign, an amendment to the Constitution to strike out the word "male" was submitted to the vote of the people, and was rejected: 22,972 votes were cast for it, and 45,682 against it. In Oklahoma, a bill conferring full suffrage on women was rejected by the House.

### RESULTS IN 1891.

**In Maine,** a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women, with an educational test, was reported adversely by the Judiciary Committee, February 17, by a vote of 7 to 2.

**In Minnesota,** a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 53 to 40 for its indefinite postponement.

**In Kansas,** March 2, the Judiciary Committee reported to the Senate adversely on a bill to confer general suffrage upon women, which had been passed by the House, and the report was accepted by a unanimous vote. The House, the same day, voted to indefinitely postpone a Constitutional Amendment giving the ballot to women.

**In Massachusetts,** March 31, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate: yeas, 9, nays, 22, with 3 pairs.

**In California,** a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the Senate, but was defeated in the House.

**In New York,** for the first time in eleven years, the advocates of woman suffrage were not strong enough to get a vote in either branch of the Legislature, though several bills had been introduced.

**In Arkansas,** a bill to give full suffrage to the white women of the State was tabled in the Senate, because manifestly unconstitutional.

**In Arizona,** the Legislative Council passed a woman suffrage bill, which failed in the House.

**In North Dakota,** a municipal suffrage bill passed the Senate, March 2, but was defeated in the House, March 6.

**In Nebraska,** March 5, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House: 44 yeas, 49 nays.

**In Michigan,** March 5, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate by a tie vote. The vote was reconsidered and the bill tabled. The bill came up again May 14, and was defeated: yeas, 14, nays, 15.

**In Illinois,** May 21, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate, 21 for to 27 against.

**In New Hampshire,** April 11, a bill to extend the right of suffrage to women owning taxable property was killed in the House.

### RESULTS IN 1892.

**In Massachusetts,** April 27, a license suffrage bill was defeated in the House, 87 yeas, 90 nays, with 6 pairs. A motion to reconsider was voted down the day following. May 2, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate: yeas, 10, nays, 22. Petitions asking for Presidential suffrage and for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution were referred to the next General Court.

**In Rhode Island,** April 26, the House, by a unanimous vote, gave "leave to withdraw" to the petitioners for Presidential suffrage.

**In New York,** the Assembly, April 16, passed, by a vote of 69 to 34, a bill which gave women the right to vote for all State officers and on every question submitted to the vote of the people. The vote of the Assembly was not taken seriously, and the Senate did not vote on the proposition.

**In Iowa,** March 12, the House defeated, by a vote of 29 yeas to 54 nays, a school suffrage bill and a municipal suffrage bill. Indefinite postponement was voted to a Presidential suffrage bill.

**In Kentucky,** a school suffrage bill was introduced, but did not reach a vote.

**In Ohio,** February 25, the House defeated a bill giving school suffrage to women.

**In Vermont,** November 2, the House, by a vote of 149 to 83, passed a bill giving women the right to vote at town meetings. The bill came before the Senate November 15, where it was killed: yeas, 10, nays, 18.

**In South Carolina,** December 19, the Senate, by a vote of 21 to 14, accepted an unfavorable report on a proposition to amend the Constitution so as to allow women to vote and to hold office.

## CONTROLLED BY EMOTION.

One of the most serious objections to the exercise of the suffrage by women is the susceptibility of women to merely emotional considerations, and the probability that their action as voters would be guided more by sentiment than by reason. This objection is scouted by the advocates of suffrage, who insist that there is nothing in it. But the result of the election in Wyoming last November attests the validity of the objection. The interesting thing about the change in the political attitude of Wyoming, which hitherto has been reckoned as surely Republican, and that by reason of its women's vote, is not so much the change itself as the processes by which it was brought about. The Cheyenne correspondent of The New York Sun, in the course of an extended review of the Wyoming election, describes the change in the women's vote and the reasons for it as follows: —

"There is no denying the fact that the women have for a long time flocked with the Republicans. The Democratic party bestowed upon them the ballot, then they tried to take it away. A Republican Governor vetoed the repealing bill, and that party has claimed them ever since. In the late election on the invasion of 'rustler' issue the women went over to the Democrats. There was something in the position of the 'rustlers' that appealed to their sense of justice. They believed, as the Democratic platform declared, that the Republican party, through its leading men in office, permitted an armed body to enter the State and assassinate and burn. The blood of one of the 'rustlers,' shot down on the road near Buffalo last winter, flowed over the package of toys he was taking home to his babies. The women voted against a possible recurrence of this sort of thing. No matter if the victim of the stockmen was a tireless professional thief, he had a wife and little ones. For the first time in the history of the State the women are with the Democrats. Extraordinary effort is being made by the Republicans to win them back. They will not change without a change of sentiment."

It appears from this that the consideration which determined the votes of many Wyoming women had nothing to do with the tariff, or silver, or any of the broad questions at issue in a national election, and was only indirectly associated even with the local issues between the "rustlers" and the cattlemen, but turned upon the accidental circumstance that one of the dead rustlers had children at home, to whom he was carrying toys when he was shot. That incident was played upon and magnified, and the women's votes were influenced by it.

It was perhaps this susceptibility of the Wyoming women to emotional influences which led General Thompson, who managed the Democratic campaign in that State, to report, after it was over, that "the woman's vote is the easiest thing in the world to get, and the easiest thing to keep, and the easiest thing to manipulate of any element in politics."

## BROADER THAN THE BALLOT.

Mr. Gladstone, in his letter to Mr. Samuel Smith, arguing against the extension of the suffrage to women, affirms that the question involved is much broader than that of the ballot. He says: —

A permanent and vast difference of type has been impressed upon women and men respectively, by the Maker of both. Their differences of social office rest mainly upon causes, not flexible and elastic like most mental qualities, but physical and in their nature unchangeable. I for one am not prepared to say which of the two sexes has the higher and which has the lower province. But I recognize the subtle and profound character of the differences between them, and I must again, and again, and again, deliberate before aiding in the issue of what seems an invitation by public authority to the one to renounce as far as possible its own office, in order to assume that of the other. I am not without the fear lest beginning with the State, we should eventually be found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental and more sacred, the precinct of the family, and should dislocate, or injuriously modify, the relations of domestic life.

## LOSING GROUND.

The vote last year in the Iowa Legislature on the suffrage question was particularly significant. The Iowa Legislature of 1882 passed through both branches a resolution to submit to the people an amendment to the Constitution, striking out the word "male" from the qualifications of electors, thus giving women full suffrage. The amendment required the action of another Legislature before going to the people: and the Senate of 1884 approved the amendment, which was, however, defeated in the House. Ten years ago, therefore, both branches of one Legislature and one branch of another were willing to give to Iowa women the full right to vote; while last year the Iowa House refused even to give them school suffrage by a vote of practically two to one, or to be exact, 29 in favor to 54 opposed. The change in public sentiment indicated by this changed attitude of the Iowa legislators proves that it is coming to be understood that the women who ask for suffrage speak only for the minority, and a small minority of their sex.

## SENTIMENT RATHER THAN PRINCIPLE.

We publish elsewhere a letter from Mr. Henry B. Blackwell regarding the woman-suffrage question, and particularly that phase of it involved in his recent recommendation that the Republicans take up the cause as the only way of regaining power. Mr. Blackwell's disclaimer of the assumption that, if women could vote, the Republicans would sweep the country, does not seem to us quite justifiable, in view of the fact that he had "pointed with pride" to Wyoming, the one State where women vote, as only "saved to Harrison by the heroic efforts of her women." However, this is not a matter of so much consequence as the claim which he now explicitly makes that whichever party gives women the right to vote will thereby acquire a lien upon their ballots, thus sustaining the ground taken by Miss Anthony over twenty years ago. We do not think so poorly of the sex as to accept this view that, if the question were, for example, a high tariff or a low one, they would inquire, not which policy would the better promote the welfare of the community, but which side had the larger number of men upon it who had voted in favor of giving women the ballot. If we did accept this estimate of women, we should consider it a strong reason against giving them the right to vote until they were able to exercise it more wisely. The chief argument urged in favor of woman suffrage has been that women would vote more conscientiously than men, whereas Mr. Blackwell's claim is that their votes would be controlled by sentiment rather than principle. — *The New York Evening Post, December 31, 1892.*

## DYNAMITE AS A SUFFRAGE AGENCY.

RATHER a startling illustration of the vehemence with which woman suffrage is advocated by some of its champions was afforded at the meeting of the Woman's Emancipation Union at Birmingham, England, last year. This conference lasted two days, and the scene which attended the discussion of the resolution for female suffrage is thus described by The London Times: —

"After the discussion had been continued by several speakers, Miss Cozens (London) said that the time for talk had passed and the time for action had come. Men were supposed to be possessed of physical force, but women had the use of dynamite the same as men, and she believed something desperate would have to be done before they got their freedom. They had no friends in men. Men had been women's mortal enemies and would be for all time to come. There had never been a bloodless revolution yet.

"Miss Southall said she would like to know whether Miss Cozens's observations were made earnestly. They would be reported in the papers and go forth as an expression of opinion of the conference.

"Miss Cozens said she was expressing her opinion as an individual, and added that if women could shoot straight men would not trifle with them as they did to-day. If they had a regiment of women who could shoot, they would have the franchise in a week.

"Miss Southall — I thought you advocated the use of dynamite.

"Miss Cozens — I do if we cannot get our freedom in any other way."

American advocates of woman suffrage do not recommend women to learn how to "shoot straight" as a necessary preliminary to acquiring political privileges, nor do they openly threaten to resort to dynamite if their demands are not granted. But the extraordinary violence of the speaker quoted above is a suggestive reminder of the fact that, in this country as well as in Europe, highly "emancipated" women are among the most reckless members of anarchistic societies, and that woman suffrage is a cardinal point in the creed of the most "progressive" and dangerous socialists.

In this connection, the following, from the Appendix to Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin's A Woman's Philosophy of Love, is interesting: —

"I have only to say in conclusion that the question is often asked, What is the difference between socialists and anarchists? After many years of study and research, I believe it to be in the main this: The theories they hold are essentially the same. The Social Democrats of Europe and America believe in achieving their ends by the use of moral agitation and the ballot; anarchists advocate a resort to force. As a Master Workman of an Assembly of Knights of Labor once said to me, 'Our beliefs are the same as those of the Social Democrats of Europe; but we do not mean to use dynamite if we can help it.'"

## HAVE ENOUGH OF IT.

THE Woman's Journal, the foremost organ of the woman suffrage movement in this country, said not long ago, editorially, that the States which have adopted school suffrage for women "are still afraid that the most disastrous results would follow municipal suffrage." This seems a singular admission. If school suffrage is working well in these States, would it not be natural to expect they would be favorably disposed toward movements for extending the suffrage still further? Is it their experience in the one form of suffrage, with its uncertain, fluctuating, and sometimes hysterical movements, which makes them "afraid" of a more advanced form? In a word, have they enough of it? It would seem that The Woman's Journal should find an explanation which is consistent with the championship of the municipal and general ballot for women.

## SUFFRAGE DEFEAT IN ENGLAND.

THE English advocates of woman suffrage secured the introduction into Parliament of a bill which extended to unmarried women rate-payers the right to vote for members of Parliament. This proposition was antagonized by Mr. Gladstone in a vigorous letter addressed to Mr. S. Smith, the Liberal leader. The bill came up on a motion for its second reading April 27, and the languid interest taken in it is indicated by the fact that more than half the members of the House of Commons absented themselves on the night when the vote was taken. Of the 670 members, only 327 went upon record. Of these, 152 voted in favor of the proposition and 175 against it, an adverse majority of 23. The advocates of the measure professed themselves as jubilant over the closeness of the vote, but when it is remembered that it was taken in less than half a House, that circumstance loses its significance.

## NOT A GOOD RALLYING CRY.

THE woman suffrage propaganda has taken on a new phase in the effort which is being made to persuade Republicans that the way back to political triumph in the nation lies through the adoption of this issue. The leading advocate of the movement argues that when the elements now composing the Republican party regain national power it will be "on some new and radical issue," and he insists that woman suffrage offers the only basis for a new departure. He would have the suffrage granted to women under educational qualifications, and urges that the votes of such women would offset the votes of illiterate male voters. Oddly, and as it seems to us rather incautiously, Wyoming is cited as an argument in support of this position. But there was nothing in the vote of Wyoming at the recent election which is calculated to make Republicans hilarious over the results of woman suffrage as therein exemplified.

That, however, is aside from the argument. The underlying misconception is that the Republican party is looking around for new issues on which to appeal for popular support, and that it is ready to pick up anything that may be suggested which is represented to have vote-getting properties. That is not the position in which the party stands. It is temporarily in the minority, but it does not propose on that account to discard its principles, or to advertise for a new outfit of a "new and radical" type. It does not believe in the principles for which it stood in the last campaign any the less because that campaign was a losing one. If parties were merely organizations designed for the purpose of getting into power, it might be in order to look around for new issues and new principles whenever defeat was experienced. We regard them as something quite different from that.

Incidentally it is painful to find those who profess to regard woman suffrage as a great principle urging its adoption on so low considerations as those of political expediency. This cause certainly is one that ought to be pressed without reference to partisanship. If women want the ballot, if they are capable of using it steadily, wisely, and to their own and the public advantage, that is one thing; but to suggest that this issue is a convenient one to assist a political party out of a dilemma is quite a different thing. Up to date there is no evidence that women, as a sex, want the ballot; so far as appears, only an insignificant, though demonstrative, minority of them desire it, or use it when permitted, and then most fitfully. If the majority of women not only do not want the ballot, but would regard it as a heavy and unnnecessary burden, some stronger reasons than have yet been put forward must be found for forcing it upon them. — *The Boston Journal, December 22, 1892.*

## AN UNCERTAIN FACTOR.

THE REMONSTRANCE, in its earlier numbers, has printed the figures of the registration and vote of women at the elections for school committee in Boston, showing a remarkable fluctuation in the vote from less than five hundred to nearly twenty thousand. The figures for later elections are now added and the table stands as follows: —

| Year. | Women Registered. | Women Voting. |
|---|---|---|
| 1881 | 748 | 640 |
| 1882 | 567 | 498 |
| 1883 | 701 | 650 |
| 1884 | 1,119 | 1,026 |
| 1885 | 2,238 | 2,062 |
| 1886 | 1,193 | 878 |
| 1887 | 837 | 725 |
| 1888 | 20,252 | 19,490 |
| 1889 | 10,589 | 10,051 |
| 1890 | 7,925 | 7,439 |
| 1891 | 6,008 | 5,428 |
| 1892 | 10,016 | 9,510 |

These figures disclose a remarkable apathy regarding the privilege of the ballot in the years from 1881 to 1887 inclusive. In 1888 there was a vehement campaign especially directed to drawing out the women's vote, on race and religious issues, and the result was the phenomenal registration and vote of that year. Then there was a steady and sharp decline for three years, the wave of enthusiasm having spent itself. Last year, the way was made much easier for the polling of the women's vote by reason of the abolition of the polltax, which had previously been a requisite. The suffragists saw this opportunity and strenuous efforts were made to get the women to vote. In spite of all this, the vote was less than half what it was in 1888. Yet the interests of the schools were presumably as important, when the women cast only 498 votes in 1882 as in 1888 when they had almost twenty thousand. Evidently the vote of women is a most uncertain and variable factor.

## TOO BUSY FOR HOME LIFE.

ATTENTION has recently been called to a divorce case which was marked by unusual and instructive features. It was a Providence man who applied for the divorce, alleging desertion: and it came out that his wife had gone to California with the intention of taking similar action, but he had anticipated her. The couple had been happy together: at least nothing to the contrary was shown of a character to justify separation. But the wife frankly explained that she felt that, if she remained at home, she "would sacrifice time and energy that ought to be devoted to the cause of women's rights, dress reform, and other movements." So she abandoned her husband and her home for the sake of these "causes." It is easy to laugh at this episode, but it has its serious aspect, and its warning ought not to be lost upon the public mind.

## FORCING THE BALLOT ON WOMAN.

THE passage which we quote below from Mr. Gladstone's letter on the woman suffrage question is as applicable here as in England, and the women remonstrants against the extension of the suffrage to women in America earnestly urge these forcible considerations upon all American Legislatures: —

There are very special reasons for circumspection in this particular case. There has never within my knowledge been a case in which the franchise has been extended to a large body of persons generally indifferent about receiving it. But here, in addition to a widespread indifference, there is on the part of large numbers of women who have considered the matter for themselves, the most positive objection and strong disapprobation. Is it not clear to every unbiassed mind that before forcing on them what they conceive to be a fundamental change in their whole social function, that is to say in their Providential calling, at least it should be ascertained that the womanly mind of the country, at present so largely strange to the subject, is in overwhelming proportion, and with deliberate purpose, set upon securing it?

## NOT ASKED, BUT REPUDIATED.

THE annual Woman Suffrage Convention is going on, and the same earnest and well-meaning people are here, as usual, trying to persuade the men (when they have n't persuaded the women) that woman suffrage would be a good thing. If these good ladies would only accept the advice of one who does not believe in the least in their theories, but who wishes fair play, they would not trouble themselves in the least about the men — they would exert all their eloquence upon their own sex. Certain it is, men will never be guilty of the infamy of forcing the suffrage upon the many millions of women in this country who do not want it, in obedience to the demands of a few thousands who do. When women want the ballot they will get it, without the least trouble in the world. It is theirs already if they choose to hold out their hands for it. But they very evidently don't want it, and won't have it — and it is in the highest degree immoral in those woman suffragists to try and load millions of their sister women down with a burden of responsibilities which is not asked, but repudiated. — *From regular Washington correspondence of Boston Transcript, January 20, 1893.*

## SUFFRAGE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

DR. HENRY B. BLACKWELL, of this city, has been writing to The New York Evening Post suggestions as to what the Republicans may do to induce the adoption of woman suffrage in the country. The Republicans have never done anything in Massachusetts, where Dr. Blackwell lives, and in this they do not differ from the Democrats. The woman suffrage cause makes no advance here. It is not a particle stronger with us than it was twenty years ago. We do not think that it makes as much progress here as it does in England. It has had very able men, like the late James Freeman Clarke and George William Curtis, among its advocates, and could they have been interested in leading it, there might have been some progress made. But the leadership during that time has fallen into the hands of Dr, Blackwell himself for the most part. He has made it a tender to one political party nearly all the time, and that party has never reciprocated by granting it any show of favor. The absolute inertion of the cause is thus easily accounted for. — *The Boston Herald, January 7, 1893.*

## FOR THE SAKE OF WOMANHOOD.

NEITHER Congress, nor the States, nor the united voice of the whole people could permanently change the essential relations of the sexes. Universal female suffrage, even if decreed, would undo itself in time; but the attempt to establish it would work deplorable mischief. The question is, whether the persistency of a few agitators shall plunge us blindfold into the most reckless of all experiments; whether we shall adopt this supreme device for developing the defects of women, and demolish their real power to build an ugly mockery instead. For the sake of womanhood, let us hope not. In spite of the effect on the popular mind of the incessant repetition of a few trite fallacies, and in spite of the squeamishness that prevents the vast majority averse to the movement from uttering a word against it, let us trust that the good sense of the American people will vindicate itself against this most unnatural and pestilent revolution. In the full and normal development of womanhood lie the best interests of the world. Let us labor earnestly for it; and, that we may not labor in vain, let us save women from the barren perturbations of American politics. Let us respect them; and, that we may do so, let us pray for deliverance from female suffrage. — *Francis Parkman.*